



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—*The Huguenot Element in Charleston's Pronunciation.*

By SYLVESTER PRIMER, PH. D.

PROFESSOR OF FRENCH AND GERMAN IN THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON, CHARLESTON, S. C.

In a paper read a year ago before this body I endeavored to sketch the main features of the Anglo-Saxon element in the pronunciation of Charleston, reserving for some future occasion the Huguenot, German, and negro influences upon the same. In the present paper, I purpose investigating the influence which the Huguenots may have had upon the English sounds; for it is evident that such a large foreign element as that of the Huguenots of Charleston, could not have been incorporated into the body politic of the State in its very infancy without exerting a considerable influence upon the manners and customs, the politics and legislation, the grammar and language, of the whole community.—But a short sketch of the Huguenot refugees in South Carolina, of their first settlements and incorporation into the state, and the gradual disappearance of the French language will, however, be necessary in order to show clearly the conditions under which the two languages met and struggled for the mastery. The conflict resulted in the supremacy of the English and the suppression of the French.

In the absence of an extended history, "there being no considerable account yet published of these South Carolina Huguenots," I have been compelled to gather my information from various pamphlets in which phrases of Huguenot history have been considered, and from local tradition. This element was very important in the first settlement of the State and contributed largely to its formation and development. The foremost patriots and statesmen came from its ranks to defend and guide the state during peril and in peaceful times of progress and advancement. Early in their history (1737) they formed in Charleston the "South Carolina Society," a "benevolent organization which, in 1837, celebrated its centennial" (PROF. WM. J. RIVERS in WINSOR'S 'Narrative and Critical History of America,' vol. v, p. 349). They have ever been identified with the party of progress and shown themselves the most public-spirited citizens on all occasions.

In tracing back the history of the Huguenots it will be found

that the larger proportion of the families came from the towns and villages of the Loire and Gironde (departments of Angoumois, Saintonge, and Aunis). They escaped first to Holland and England and passed thence to this country. The little district of Aunis, which had been cut off from Saintonge and appended to La Rochelle, was more especially the birthplace of American Huguenots, since it sent a larger number to us than any other part of France. Saintonge and La Rochelle were well represented. The island of Ré, just opposite La Rochelle, also sent a small quota. But emigrants from all parts of France gathered here,—Picardy, Bretagne, Tours, St. Amboise, Poitou, Soubise, Normandy, Guyenne, Loudun, St. Soline, Montpellier, Paris, Berry, Brie, Dieppe, being represented. Switzerland also furnished a few settlers from Yverdon.—We shall have to base our investigation principally, therefore, on the pronunciation of the French of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in and about La Rochelle, La Saintonge, and Aunis, with allowances for dialectical differences for the other sections represented.

The first notice we have of the French settling in South Carolina is in 1670, when Richard Batin, Jacques Jours, Richard Deyos, and others were made freeholders with the same rights in every respect as the English colonists. WEISS in his history of the Huguenots says: "Everything induces us to believe that these French emigrants were refugees for religion's sake, for the state archives of Charleston contain numerous like concessions, made to Huguenot fugitives, during the first years of the establishment of the colony. In 1677, to Jean Bullon; in 1678, to Jean Bazant and Richard Gaillard; in 1683, to Marie Batton, wife of Jean Batton." In 1680, the English frigate, *The Richmond*, brought over forty-five French refugees to Carolina "by express command of Charles II, who paid himself the expenses of their transportation. A more considerable number soon followed them, in another vessel chartered by the English government" (*Ibid.*). Besides the Huguenots who came directly to South Carolina, many of those who had settled in various parts of America finally immigrated there. For this reason, a large proportion of the French fugitives seeking an asylum in this country settled definitely in this State where the climate was so nearly like that of Southern France. The most of the French refugees in Virginia and North Carolina left their first American homes and removed to the French settlements in and about Charleston, "the Home of the Huguenots in the New World."

They established themselves in various places of secondary importance, but formed three principal colonies: 1. Orange Quarter, on the banks of Cooper River; 2. Santee; 3. Charleston.

1. Orange Quarter, on the banks of the Cooper River, lay amid the primitive forests where they could "worship God without fear of man or of royal edicts, and their psalms mingled with the free winds of heaven." In the early days of the settlement they used to attend church in Charleston, rowing thither in their convenient boats. They first formed a settlement on the site of the modern Strawberry Ferry, where they built a church, "of which Florent Philippe Trouillart became the first pastor."

2. The Santee received its principal grant of three hundred acres of land in 1705, to René Ravenel, Barthélemy Gaillard, and Henri Bruneau. One hundred (some say one hundred and eighty) French families settled here and built Jamestown. According to the best information their first pastor was Pierre Robert, a Swiss, "who doubtless accompanied a party of the fugitives in their escape from France." This became the most flourishing colony of French emigrants to South Carolina after that of Charleston and "even acquired such importance, that the name of French Santee was given to that part of the country, which may still be found upon the old maps of North America." There were here also about sixty English families. Later, the Rev. Philip de Richbourg, "a worthy and pious man," became their pastor, or, according to some accounts, he was their first minister.

3. Far the richest and most populous Huguenot settlement was in the city of Charleston, "where entire streets were built by them. One still bears the name of the founder, Gabriel Guignard." Their first pastor was Elias Prioleau, the grandson of Antoine Prioli, who is said to have been the Doge of Venice in 1618. Elias Prioleau, was "doubtless the son of Benjamin Prioli, the godson of the Duke of Soubise, whom the Duke of Rohan had attached to himself during his sojourn in Italy." Among those affected by the edict of Nantes, "he brought from Saintonge a part of his flock, and took up his abode in Charleston, where the family exists even in our day." Among the most prominent Huguenot families who settled in Charleston and most of whose descendants are still represented and held in honor are the Bayards, Bonneaus, Benoits, Bocquets,

Bacots, Chevaliers, Cordes, Chastaquiers, Duprès, Delisles, Duboses, Dubois, Dutarques, De la Coursilières, Dubouxdieus, Fayssaux, Gaillards, Gendrons, Horrys, Guignards, Hugers, Legarés, Laurens, Lausacs, Marions, Mazycqs, Manigaults, Mallichamps, Neuville, Péronneaus, Porchers, Peyres, Ravenels, Saint Juliens, and Trevezants.

As late as 1764, the South Carolina Huguenots were further strengthened by two hundred and twelve exiles whom their pastor Gilbert accompanied. The English government furnished their passage; and vacant lands in Abbeville county were distributed to them. Here they soon built a town and named it New Bordeaux "in honor of the capital of Guienne, where most of them were born." In 1782 South Carolina numbered sixteen thousand Protestants among its citizens (the whole number being about forty thousand), of whom the greater part were French. "A politeness and elegance of manners, far superior to those of English origin, a severe morality, an unalterable charity—such were the qualities by which the refugees obtained the esteem of their fellow citizens. The little colony of French Santee became particularly noted for the exquisite urbanity of its founders. Thanks to the intolerance of Louis XIV, the French language, and with it all the perfections and all the refinements of French society in the seventeenth century, were propagated by them in these distant countries where, until then, the austere and solemn character of the English puritans had almost exclusively ruled," (WEISS i, p. 378). The conditions here described refer especially to New England. Along the coast of South Carolina puritanism found no acceptance. The finer courtly manners of England ruled; the contrast between the English and the French was not so glaring as in New England. Still that contrast which always exists between English and French manners can be perceived even here.

In determining the duration of the French language in South Carolina, the French churches will be the surest guides; for as long as the people generally spoke French, or even understood it, the service would be conducted in that language. Certain families would, of course, continue to use their native tongue in their home-life long after its discontinuance in the church service; this is more especially true in the country settlements, for in Charleston itself the French was discontinued from the very fact that no one understood the language. There is, however, no way of controlling information on this point except by tradi-

tion, a rather unsafe, though indispensable guide. I shall use both history and tradition in my endeavor to trace the history of the French language to its final disappearance.

There were in all, four French Protestant churches. The one in Charleston has ever been the principal one. It is the only one which has survived the great changes that have taken place since it was first founded in 1681 or 1682. Three outside the city were founded and maintained for a long time ; one on the Santee, one at Orange Quarter, and one at St. John's Berkeley. "They are of the same opinion as the church at Geneva, having no difference among them concerning punctilios of the Christian faith ; which union hath propagated a happy and delightful concord in all matters throughout the whole neighborhood, living among themselves as one tribe or kindred, every one making it his business to be assistant to the wants of his countrymen—preserving his estate and reputation with the same exactness and concern as he does his own ; all seeming to share in the misfortunes and in the advancement of their brethern" (Surveyor-General LAWSON, of North Carolina). "The three churches of French Protestants outside the city of Charleston, were served by their pastors with great faithfulness—that upon the Santee, by the Rev. Pierre Robert and the Rev. Claude Phillipe de Richbourg ; that on Cooper River, by the Rev. Mr. La Pierre, and that at St. John's Berkeley, by the Rev. Florente Phillipe Trouillard. These three churches were merged, at length, in the established church of the colony. The Church of England became established by law in 1706. Too poor to sustain, uninterruptedly, their own ordinances ; subject to great disabilities had they been able ; offered support for their church and minister by the government, they gradually yielded. Practically they did not conform to Episcopal authority until the decease of their Huguenot ministers—Mr. La Pierre, in 1728 ; Mr. de Richbourg, in 1717, and Mr. Trouillard, in 1712" (DR. VEDDER, 'Charleston Year Book,' 1885, p. 299-300). The dates of the discontinuance of service in the French language are much later, as will be shown directly.

In the city of Charleston itself, the Huguenot church was more fortunate. It can show a long list of French pastors, extending through the eighteenth and into the first quarter of the nineteenth century. From 1816 to 1819, the Rev. Mr. Henry officiated and "preached alternately in French and English. Even the partial disuse of the French language by

Dr. Henry gave dissatisfaction, and the calling of pastor Courlat marks a return to the purely French service. The attempt failed, in the presence of the fact that French had ceased to be spoken, or generally understood, especially by the children of the immigrants. The congregation had so diminished, that a resolution was adopted, in 1828, to re-open the church with the service wholly in English" (DR. VEDDER, *ibid.*).—The present Huguenot Church probably used the French service about seventy years after it had ceased to be the language of the French Protestant churches outside the city. Sixty years have elapsed since its disuse in the service of the church. Tradition tells us, that probably none of the handful of its Huguenot members at the time of the change from French to English were able to speak or understand the French. It would, however, not seem unreasonable to conjecture that at least a few must have understood it, even if they did not speak it; else the French service would necessarily have been discontinued before. It certainly soon ceased to be spoken or understood; for, according to the best information on the subject, not even the oldest Huguenots of Charleston ever understood or spoke it, and some are well on to eighty.

The causes of the rapid disuse of the French language are briefly as follows: Having been so well received by the English king and people, and having accepted the protection of the British crown and grants of land in the new world, they would probably be influenced by a grateful sense of duty to become faithful subjects in every respect. The recollection of their bitter persecution in their native country would cause them to forget as speedily as possible anything of a distinctly national character. There was no inducement for them to preserve their mother-tongue and the children were not encouraged to speak French. By far the greatest reason was, however, their complete isolation. Under the circumstances it was impossible to maintain any relations with France. In Canada and Louisiana, where the conditions were exactly reversed, the native tongue is still spoken. State and Church also contributed to its discontinuance. The French churches surrendered their independence "in part from the difficulty of obtaining ministers of their own faith; and in part, also, from the fact that the pastors were provided by the zeal of the English church, their salaries paid, and the churches, parsonages, schoolhouses, built and kept in repair at the public expense; while all these things came as a

heavy burden upon a people few in number and settled in a new country. Probably their greatest reason was the difficulty they encountered in their attempts to keep up the succession of their ministry." (HOWE, 'Hist. of the Presbyterian Church,' p. 192). The English Church gained the supremacy and was early acknowledged, as it were, to be the legal church of the province, receiving government aid. The Protestants, especially those of foreign birth, were at first considered aliens and disfranchised unless they conformed to the established church. To be sure this was only temporary, but it had great influence on emigrants.

Their supply of ministers was inadequate to the demand. Numerous applications for French ministers were sent to England in the hope that some of the fugitive French ministers there, would be induced to come, but this source soon failed. Therefore in 1706 the inhabitants of St. James petitioned the assembly "to have their settlement made a parish, and, at the same time, expressed their desire of being united to the Church of England." This is St. James on the Santee which contained one hundred French families. Its pastor, Philip de Richbourg, died in 1717 and was followed, in 1720, by the Rev. Mr. Pouderos, a French clergyman who was sent over by the Bishop of London. About 1707 and 1708, Dr. Le Jau (or Jeau) "sometimes visited, the French settlement in Orange Quarter, St. Dennis Parish, which had no minister, and administered the Lord's supper to fifty communicants. That settlement consisted of thirty-two families." "Most of them (the Huguenots) settled in the parishes of St. Dennis and St. James, on Santee, and to them in their ecclesiastical capacity were extended the privileges of the established church with a permission to perform all their public religious exercises in the French language, provided they used Dr. Durel's translation of the book of common prayer. Those of them who settled in Charleston formed a church about the beginning of the eighteenth century on the plan of the reformed churches in France. It is rich in lands; but so many of the descendants of its original founders have joined other churches that its present numbers are few" (RAMSAY, ii, p. 88). "During this period (1730-1740) the French churches seem to have settled quietly down, excepting the one in Charleston (and perhaps in some measure that in Orange Quarter), under English rule. The Bishop of London very sagaciously supplied them with a ministry of French extraction,

who were proficient in the French language, and would be less likely to bring to their notice the change which they had made. The names of Le Jau, of Tustian, of Pouderous, of Varnod, of Tissot, of Coulet, of Du Plessis, were familiar to the French Huguenots; and with the influence these men exerted, may have done much to reconcile them to leave the customs of their fathers." (HOWE, *Ibid.*, p. 217). One more extract will put the matter in its true light. It is from CARROLL'S 'Collections,' ii, p. 553 (Year 1709.) "The district of Orange Quarter is a French settlement, but in the first division of the country into parishes, was part of St. Thomas's Parish; few of the people attended service in the English for want of the language. The major portion of them usually met together in a small church of their own, where they generally made a pretty full congregation, when they had a French minister amongst them; they were poor and unable to support their minister, and made application to the assembly of the province to be made a parish, and to have some (p. 554) publick allowance for a minister especially ordained, who should use the liturgy of the Church of England, and preach to them in French. Accordingly they were incorporated by the name of St. Dennis, till such time as they should understand English. They have now a good church built about the time St. Thomas's was, and never had but one minister, Mr. Lapierre."

All the information we can find on the subject points to the discontinuance of the French service in the country churches at about 1750. Tradition tends to the same conclusion. The names of this region still preserve their English pronunciation; "in spite of refinements and improvements of Modern Society, the Duboses and Marions are pertinaciously called Debusk and Máhrion" (PROF. F. A. PORCHER). In Charleston, however, the pronunciation of the proper names has retained more of the French than of the English, as will be seen by the list later on.

In my former article, I gave a very unsatisfactory sketch of the education, reading and books of the early period of the province. I shall now attempt to complete the sketch, including all the settlers as far as that is possible. Here again I shall have to rely upon original sources and tradition. For the Huguenot element, tradition will be my only source of information, as there is no account of their literature and schools. The probability is that they brought few books with them and maintained no French schools in their new home. They certainly produced

nothing of a literary nature after their arrival. Only a few public documents, mostly wills, can be found in French. I shall quote my authorities verbatim, as the books are rare and not accessible to all. In DRAYTON'S 'Memoirs,' ii, p. 358, the author speaks as follows of the education of this period: "Before the American war, the citizen of South Carolina was too much prejudiced in favor of British manners, customs and knowledge to imagine that elsewhere than in England anything of advantage could be obtained. For reasons also, of state, perhaps, this prejudice was encouraged by the mother country, and hence the children of opulent parents were sent there for education, while attempts for supporting suitable seminaries of learning in this state were not sufficiently encouraged and promoted." In the writings of HUGH S. LEGARE, article on Education, the following occurs: "Before and just after the Revolution, many, perhaps it would be more accurate to say most, of our youth of opulent families were educated at English schools and universities. There can be no doubt their attainments in polite literature were very far superior to those of their contemporaries at the North, and the standard of scholarship in Charleston was consequently higher than in any other city on the continent."

Much has been written pro and con on the question of the early schools of the state. We can here neither enter into a partisan controversy nor give the subject a thorough and conscientious investigation from a historical point of view, as both are foreign to our present purpose. A summary of the matter will be found in WINSOR'S 'Narrative and Critical History of America' (vol. v.), in an article by PROF. J. RIVERS, and in GEN. MCCRADY'S reply to MR. MCMASTER in his 'History of the United States.' I quote from the original sources as much as will be necessary for information about the educational condition of the province and state.

PROF. RIVERS (as above, p. 303, Note) says: "It is probable there were in North and South Carolina many "private tutors" for families or neighborhoods, though few "public schools" supported by taxation" (1754). RAMSAY (vol. ii. of his 'History of South Carolina,' pp. 357, 362, 372, 376, 382) gives a fairer view of the whole system of education in the state. I give the important part (pp. 357-8) "The corporations of these free schools were cherished by government. They were favored in taking uplands which have ever since been increasing in value.

They formed a center to which were drawn the donations and bequests of the charitable. From the triple source of tuition money, public bounty and private donations, a fund was created which diffused the means of education far beyond what could have been accomplished by uncombined exertions conducted without union or system.

With the growing wealth of the province the schools became more numerous and co-extended with the spreading population. The number of individuals who could afford to maintain private tutors and of natives who were sent abroad for education increased in like manner. None of the British provinces in proportion to their numbers sent so many of their sons to Europe for education as South Carolina. (With the exception of Virginia, no State in the Union has obtained a greater or even an equal proportion of national honors. This was in some degree the consequence of the attention paid by the early settlers of Carolina to the liberal education of their children)."

In speaking of schools and colleges he says (p. 359): "Men of moderate circumstances had not influence enough to carry it through (a bill for a college), and the rich did not need it; for they disregarded the expense of sending their sons to the seminaries of Europe."

Societies were formed which aided the cause of education by their influence and substantial support. "Education," says RAMSAY, p. 362, "has also been fostered in South Carolina by several societies as a part of a general plan of charity. The oldest of this class is the South Carolina Society which was formed about the year 1737. It pays the salary of a school-master and schoolmistress for the education of children of both sexes."

RAMSAY'S general remarks on the subject of education are worth repeating (pp. 372-3): "Though the state and individuals have done much to encourage education among the youth of Carolina, the proportion of the rising generation which is pressing forward with such ardent zeal for knowledge, as bids fair to secure them seats in the temple of fame is lamentably small. In genius they are not deficient, but perseverance in a long-continued close application to study is too often wanting. Many of them will not learn Greek at all. Others learn it so superficially that it is soon forgotten. Very few can bring their knowledge of either Latin or Greek classics to bear on any subject of conversation, or writing, seven years after they have

done with school. What is thoroughly learned cannot be so easily forgotten. A few with little or no classical education, by the help of superior natural powers and an industrious course of English reading, have made a distinguished figure in public life. Their success, like the largest prizes in a lottery, inspire false hopes in the breasts of others who have neither the talents nor the industry of those whom they affect to resemble. So much of the precious period of youth is frequently spent in doing nothing of any value or in frivolous amusements, that too little is left for completing a solid education in its proper season. Whether this is attained or not, the pursuit of it oftener terminates under twenty, than continues beyond that period. Several affect to be men, and some are really fathers when they ought to be at school."

On pp. 382-383, RAMSAY gives a summary of the results of the educational efforts to the beginning of the present century (1810): "In the course of the 106 years while South Carolina was a colony, the whole number of persons born there who obtained the honors of literary degrees in colleges or universities, as far as can be recollected, is short of twenty; but in the thirty-two years of her independence one hundred of her native sons have acquired that distinction. There was no grammar school in South Carolina prior to 1730, except the free school in Charleston: from 1730 to 1776 there were no more than four or five, and all in or near Charleston. Since the revolution there are, from information, about thirty and they are daily increasing and extending into the remotest extremities of the state."

DR. MANIGAULT has kindly furnished me a list of American students at the London law schools in the last century published in the English papers and copied in the Charleston News and Courier in January 1870. The period is from 1759 to 1786, a quarter of a century just before and during the revolution. It shows better than anything else how fashionable it was in the colonies to send the sons to England for their education. The numbers are as follows:

Middle Temple, total	77;	South Carolina	39.
Inner Temple,	" 24;	"	2.
Lincolns Inn	" 15;	"	7.
Total	116		48

Total of French extraction from South Carolina 12; that is,

just one fourth of the whole number sent. Thus, South Carolina sent a little more than 41 per cent of the whole number, of which one fourth were of French extraction. The other Huguenots were educated in the (English) schools of the province; for at this period none are known to have gone to France, and no French schools were ever supported.* After the revolution, in the beginning of this century, it became somewhat fashionable to go to France for an education, but by that time all knowledge of French (except that learned at the school) had disappeared. The continuity of the mother-tongue had been broken with the first emigration to this country and could never be resumed again.

Schools, however, are not the only means of an education, especially of a literary character. Libraries and books perform an important part in the education of a community and the early settlers were alive to this important fact. One of the early writers (cf. CARROLL'S 'Collections,' i., p. 507) informs us "that the people stand not only much indebted to an ingenious bookseller, who introduced many of the most distinguished authors among them, but several of the most respectful citizens, also, united and formed a society for the promotion of literature, having obtained a charter of incorporation for that purpose. All the new publications in London, and many of the most valuable books, both ancient and modern, have been imported for the use of this society. Their design was not confined to the present generation, but extended to posterity, having the institution of a college in view, so soon as the funds of the society should admit it. Newspapers were also printed for supplying the province with the freshest and most useful intelligence of all that passed in the political and commercial world" (1765). RAMSAY adds something of interest on this subject in the second volume of his 'History of South Carolina,' p. 352: "The Settlement of Carolina was nearly coeval with the institution of the Royal Society of London, and began at a time when Addison, Boyle, Boerhaave, Barrow, Fenelon, Hale, Locke, Milton, Newton, Rollin, Sydney, Sydenham, Sloan, Tillotson, Watts, and many sons of intellect were living and enlightening the world with the beams of knowledge. Though few if any of the early settlers of the province were learned men, yet they brought with them general ideas of European literature.

*There were private French Boarding and Day Schools and ever have been, but these were for the upper classes. In the public school system no provision was made for French.

The subsequent improvements in the old world were soon transmitted to the new, and by the noble art of printing extensively diffused." In the year 1700 a law passed "for securing the provincial library of Charleston."

The Church of England also aided in the promotion of education by establishing libraries throughout the state. "Commissioner Bray and his associates founded several Provincial and Parochial Libraries; and the venerable society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts sent to every Parish Church in the Colonies, a library for the use of the ministry.

The advantage resulting from Parochial Libraries would not be confined to the Clergy, but would extend equally to the people."

It will be seen from the above that the relations between the province of South Carolina and the mother-country were far more intimate than those of the other provinces. The children, as a rule, spent years in England while pursuing their studies; the Church established by the Proprietors and people was under the Bishop of London, and the ministers came from England; libraries were founded by the church and by private enterprise, and the favorite books were those imported from England. We, however, see no signs of an early provincial literature comparable with that of New England. The people lived as in England, thought as in England, were thoroughly English in every respect. But the French element had an influence upon the education and manners of the province. Noted for their sobriety and orderly habits, for their industry and application to their pursuits, for their love of religious freedom and tolerance in general, for their intellectual superiority over their countrymen of the Catholic faith, they brought with them very desirable qualities for the upbuilding of the new state. Their influence is seen in the industrial progress of the state, in the formation and development of the new government, in the social life of the people. Their influence on the schools, the formation of libraries, the circulation of books, the literary development of the young state must have been equally felt and equally beneficial, whether we can trace that influence as clearly and as distinctly as in the political, industrial and social history of the state. The histories are silent on the subject of Huguenot schools, libraries, books and intellectual pursuits and accomplishments, so that we are forced to rely on tradition and information gathered from older people and accounts of the Huguenots in

other parts of the world. From these sources we can collect information enough to lead us to conclude that they were active in developing the school system of their chosen state and fostered its literary growth. But they fostered the English language and discarded their own as soon as possible ; however, it could not disappear without leaving some sign of its former presence, though the difficulty of tracing back the vestiges of that presence will be very great.

The influence of the Huguenot element upon the pronunciation of Charleston can be detected in two ways. In the first place a careful comparison of the Huguenot proper names and their present pronunciation with their earlier pronunciation, as near as that can be determined after so long a time, will show the mutual influence of the Huguenot and English pronunciations upon each other. Secondly, a careful comparison of the vowel and consonant sounds of the French and English of that early period and a careful investigation of the historical development of the same, will show a like mutual influence upon the final pronunciation of Charleston. Early documents of both languages, with the approximate pronunciation in each case, must form the basis of this investigation. Here we shall give only the French documents, reserving the early English for a revision of our former article.

Fortunately there exists a list of the Huguenot names drawn up in the year 1697 (or thereabout) from which we shall take such names for our comparison as are still in existence. The following list comprises enough for our present purpose :

NAME.	APPROX. EAR. FR. PR.	PRESENT PRON.	MODIFICATIONS.
Bacot ¹	Bako (or ò)	Bakot	
Benoist	Benîte?		Now Bennet?
Benoit	As above		As above
Bonneau	Bono (or eò ?) ²	Bono	
Bonell	Bonel	Bonel	Bónel
Bonetheu	Boneteu	Bónepo	
Bounetheau	Boneto (or eò ?)	As above	
Bordeau	Bordo (or eò ?)	Bordo	

¹ The accent is the same as in French unless otherwise indicated. SWEET's Revised Romic is used.

² THUROT (ii, p. 749) says " Dans la terminaison *eau* l'*e* féminin se fit entendre longtemps, ... mais on n'entendait plus que *o* dans la plupart des mots." But the pronunciation of *Beaufort* and *Beaufain* (Beufort, Beufain) would lead to the inference that *-eau* was pronounced (*eo*) by the French Huguenots who settled here.

NAME.	APPROX. EAR. FR. PR.	PRESENT PRON.	MODIFICATIONS.
Boyd	Boid	Boid	
Carriere	Karie (r)	Karir	
Carrere	Karer	As above	Karer ?
Collin	Kolaeq	Kolins	
Collins	As above	As above	
Cordes	Kord	Kords	
Couturier	Kutyrie (r)	Kutrîr	
Couterier	Kuterie (r)	As above	
De Hay (s)	Dëai ?	Dîheiz	
De Leiselin	Dëleizaeq	Dêléslin ?	
De Saussure	Dësosyr	Désasur	Desasor (vul.)
Deveaux	Dëvo (or eò ?)	Dëvo	Divo
Douxaint	Dusaeq	Diu²sentz	Daksent (a=u in <i>but</i>)
Dubois	Dybtë ?	Diu²boz	
Dubosc (or q)	Dybosc ?	Diu²boz	Dibask (a=u in <i>but</i>)
Dubose	Dyboz	As above	
Dupont	Dypoq	Diu²pont	
Dupree	Dypre	Diu²pri	Diu²pre
Dutarque	Dytark	Diu²tart	
Gabriel (le)	Gabriel (l)	Gebriel	
Gaillard	Gaijar	Geljard	
Gendron	Zhaqdroq	Dzhëndan	Zhaqdroq
Girardeau	Zhirardo (or eò ?)	Dzherido	Zherardo (La.)
Gourdin (ain)	Gurdaeq	Gurdain	Gridain ? (vul.)
Guerard	Gerar	Gerard	Gered, Geret
Guirri (Guerry)	Geri	Geri	
Horry	Hori	Ori	Hori ?
Huger	Hyzhe (r)	Judzhi	
La Roche	La Rosh	Larotsh	
Laurens	Loraq	Lôrens	
Legaré	Legare	Legri	
Manigault	Manigo	Manigo	
Marie	Mari	Mâri (Fr.)	
Marion	Marioq	Mârian	Mérian
Mellichamp	Melishaq	Melishamp	
Mercier	Mersie (r)	Märsir (ä = i in sir)	Märsr (ä=i in <i>Sir</i>)
Mouzon	Muzoq	Miu³znn	
Neufville	Nevil	Nevîl	
Normand	Normaq	Nôrmand	
Peronneau	Perono (or eò ?)	Pérono	
Pereneau	Pereno (or eò ?)	As above	
Peyre	Perr	Per	
Prioleau	Priolo (or eò ?)	Prélo	Prêlr ? (vul.)
Poinset (te)	Poeqset	Poinset	
Porcher	Porshe (r)	Porshe	
Postell	Postel	Postel	
Poyas	Püeya ?	Païos	
Ravenel	Ravenel	Ravenel	Ravnel
St. Julien	Saeqzhyliaq	Sînt djîzulan	
Simons	Simoq	Sîmans	
Tousiger	Tusizhe (r)	Tûsidjer	Tatshî ? (a=u in <i>but</i>)
Trezevant	Trezevaq	Trézvant	

2 THUROT (ii, p. 749). Cf. note 2 p. 227.

3 The sign (u²) represents the sound (u) accompanied by a slight vanish.

It will be seen that with few exceptions the proper names have retained their French forms, though the pronunciation has been modified in many cases by time and contact with the English. They are still, however, to all intents and purposes French. Here we shall call attention to only a few peculiarities, as the influence of the French vowels and consonants will best be considered after the French extracts from the public documents. The place of the French accent is occasionally changed; compare Bónetheau (Fr. Bonethéau), Cólins (Fr. Collins), Dé Saussure (Fr. De Saussúre), Gíardeau (Fr. Girardéau), Márie (Fr. Marié), Mellichamp (Fr. Mellichámp), Príoleau (Fr. Prioléau), Póyas (Fr. Poyás), Símons (Fr. Simóns), Trézevant (Fr. Trezevánt). In all, less than a dozen out of over sixty—a very small proportion. The changes in the vowels and consonants have not been so great as we might have expected when we consider the influence brought to bear on them. A few transformations surprise us. Compare Couturier (Kutrír), De Sausure (Désosur), Douxsaint (Diu^ssent, or Dáksent), Gourdin (Gurdain), Huger (Judzhi), Legaré (Legri), Poyas (Páijos).

The French documents consist of wills and contracts found in the city archives. They all belong to the last decade of the fifteenth century and the first decade of the nineteenth and bear witness of having been written by the persons themselves. There are others which seem to have been written by lawyers, but it was deemed best to use those drawn up by the persons themselves, as containing the language of the people.

Will of Pierre Bertrand, dated the 8th of Sept., 1692 :

Au Nom De Dieu

Moy Pierre Bertrand natue de St Martin en L'isle de Ré au Royaume de France agé de uingt quatre ans ou enuiron Estant au Lit malade—Mais Sin Desprit et dentendement et Sachant quil ny a rien plus certain que La Mort Je me suis resolu a faire mon testament et dernier uollanté Comme il sensuít

Premiérement Je remercie dieu de mauior fait naitre dans la ueritable religion Reformée et Luy demande pardon de tous mes peches au non et par le meritte de la mort et passion et resurrection de Nostre Seigneur, Jesus christ le priant de Nentrer pas en conte Ny en Jugement auecq moy mais me faire grace et Misericorde et me faire part de son paradis.

Will of Pierre Perdriau, dated Nov. 26th, 1692 :

Au Nom du pere, du fils, et du St Esprit, Amen.

Jay Pierre Perdriau natif de la Rochelle au royaume de France, 'tant de present en Caroline détenu au lit de maladie depuis 6 ou 7 jours; mais par la grace de Dieu sain desprit, memoire, jugement et entendement et considerant quil ny a rien de plus certain que la

mort ny de plus incertain que l'heure dycelle ne voullant decedder intestat ny sans auoir fait mettre ma derniere volonté par écrit, jay fait écrire mon present testament et ordonnance de derniere volonté sans y auoir été induit, forcé, ny contraint par qui que se soit comme sensuit.

Will of Arnaud Brunau, dated Dec. 30th, 1692 :

Je Arnaud Brunau Escuyer S. de la Chabociere étant de present en Caroline en l'amerique en nostre habitation de Ouanthee proche Jemston sur la riuere de Santi auquel lieu d'ouenthe nous nous sommes establis Paul Bruneau Esquyer Sieur de Riuedoux mon fils et Henry Bruneau mon petit fils et moy et ou depuis plus de quatre ans nous faisons nostre residence sachant quil nous faut tous mourir et quil nest rien de si certain que l'heure de la mort, me trouuant dautant plus obligé a disposer de mes affaires quil y a trois ans ou enuiron que le fus attaqué dun catherre dont je pensé mourir et qui ma laissé un grand engourdissement sur toute la partie gauche de mon corps qui men a fort afoibly tous les membres me trouuant pourtant graces a dieu dans une assez bonne disposition de mon corps et seint de mon Esprit.

Agreement between Pierre Robert and son (Swiss), dated Jan. 25th, 1701.

Sorte que châcun de nous separément et sans le consentement de l'autre, ne pourra vendre ny engager sa part des terres, ny des Esclaves, mais nous pourrons d'un consentement mutuel, lorsque nous jurerons à propos, vendre conjointement mon dit fils et moy, ou le dit fonds de terre ou les Esclaves, ou partie d'eux.

In discussing the influence of the French element upon the English pronunciation of Charleston we must remember that the Huguenots left France at the period when the fluctuations between the different vowels (*a* and *e*, *o* and *ou*, *eu* and *ou*, *o* and *e*) had nearly ceased. There were at that time three distinct pronunciations: the pure pronunciation of the cultured people and scholars, in a certain measure theoretical; both the second and third belong to the so-called vulgar language; the second was that used in reading poetry and in public discourses, and the third was the every-day language of the common people. The Huguenots belonged to the artisan class and must have brought with them to South Carolina the second and third grades. Their ministers and the educated spoke in all probability the more cultured of these; that is, the second, or that used in poetry and public discourses.—A short summary of these sounds will form a basis for our investigation; we shall treat the sounds here in the same order (that is, *i*, *e*, *a*, *A*, *o*, *u*, *ö*, *ü*) as in our former article (cf. 'Trans. Mod. Lang. Ass.,' vol iii., p. 88).

The pronunciation of the vowels (*i*) is very narrow. It exchanges with (*e*), but in the cultured language, however, there was no exchange.—Tonic *e*, whatever its origin, in the language

of the cultured class as well as of the vulgar, was pronounced wide, even very wide, consequently near *a*, whenever it was followed by a consonant pronounced in the same syllable. "The German *è* in *der*, would be the back-upper, and probably also the English *a* of *dare*, the French *è* of *père, aime*, the front-lower. The *è* of the sixteenth century was likewise the lower" (cf. LANG, 'Der vocalische Lautstand,' p. 20). But words in *-ere*, especially *père, mère, frère*, and words in *-ege*; as, *collège, privilège*, continued to be pronounced with an *é-fermé*, that is, narrow.

The *a* had its two sounds of wide *a* (*patte, mal*) and narrow *a* (*pâte, mâle*). Even the narrow (grave THUROT calls it) retained quite a clear (high) sound and was different from the darker (deep) German *a*. Generally it was very wide.

The digraph *au* probably had the sound of *ɔ*, and may have fluctuated as the English *gaunt*, etc. It exchanges with *o* (*ɔ* wide? Comp. *pauvre* below), also with *a*.

There were two *o*-sounds, wide and narrow: *ɔ, ô*.

The *u*-sound (*ou*) was simple *u* and no longer a diphthong, but frequently exchanged with *o*; as, *chose* or *chouse*, etc.

We need mention only one peculiarity of the consonants, the palatalization of *c* and *g* before *i, e, eu* (see below).

It is always a difficult question to attempt to trace the mutual influence which two languages may have exerted upon each other, as it is often uncertain just what the native development would have been without the aid of foreign influence. This is especially true of sounds. Similar causes may have produced similar effects independently in each language; or mutual influence, arising from the contact of the sounds of each, especially if the two languages belong to different branches, as the French and the English. The influence of the former upon the development of the vowel system of the latter, has been very great, though difficult to analyse, as the two streams flowed together at such an early date that it would now be impossible to say in most instances whether Romance or Teutonic influences had been most active in producing certain changes. Still much light might be thrown on the subject by a thorough investigation of the mutual influence of the two elements upon each other.

It is customary to ascribe Romance influence to the introduction of Romance words at four various periods: 1. the occupation of Britain by the Romans; 2. the conversion of England to the Christian Religion; 3. the Norman Conquest; 4. the Revival

of Learning. The real sway of the French tongue, during which it exerted its greatest influence upon the language, forms, according to excellent authority, two periods: the first comprises the time of the Norman Conquest, when French was really at home in England, to the loss of Normandy; the second, when the French was a foreign language in England, extends from the loss of Normandy to the end of the reign of Edward III. The first is often called the Norman, the second the French, period. But we are far from knowing at the present date the exact truth in regard to the mixture and development of the two languages. The frequent and intimate intercourse of the two nations has led to a peculiar development of the English vowel system and to irregular changes in English pronunciation. It is, therefore, doubly difficult to trace out the Huguenot influence upon the pronunciation of Charleston. In the first place, we have the uninterrupted flow for centuries of Romance elements into England. Changes in certain directions appeared in England. The language was transplanted here during the process of change and either became permanent, or, from various influences, was again subject to change. The French Huguenot element brought with it the same influences which had modified the English in England. To which influence, if to either, is the present pronunciation of Charleston due? It is not always possible to tell. We know approximately the period and can follow up the changes from that time to this. Wherever the pronunciation of Charleston shows peculiarities, we must either trace them back to the English of the time of the first settlement here, or account for them from outside influence. If we find similarities between the present pronunciation of Charleston and the Huguenot pronunciation of the time of their first settlement here, it will be *prima-facie* evidence of influence, though not positive evidence; for the development of sounds is often such as to defy explanation by any known laws. Bearing this in mind, let us examine the pronunciation of Charleston in order to discover whether the Huguenot element has had any influence upon it.

In our comments on the vowel *i* (ibid. 88) we mentioned the exchange of *i* for *e* in *if* (in Charleston *ef*). The proper name *Prioleau* is here commonly pronounced *Prelo*. In the sixteenth century these vowels were interchangeable in France and this phenomenon did not disappear altogether in the seventeenth century. However, it is not an uncommon phenomenon as ELLIS remarks (ibid. 99). The change here is probably

due to that tendency in the Charleston pronunciation to retain the older English pronunciation, though the influence of the French may have helped to strengthen that tendency.

The peculiar pronunciation of words like *there*, *tare*, *pare*, etc. (p. 88) corresponds quite well to that of the French of the sixteenth century (see above). THUROT (vol. ii, p. 748) remarks that in the seventeenth century words in *-ere*, especially *père*, *mère*, *frère*, and words in *-ege*; as, *collège*, *privilège*, continued to be pronounced with *e-fermé*. But in the last years of the seventeenth and the first years of the eighteenth centuries this *é* of *père*, *mère*, *frère*, *collège*, *privilège*, became open (*è*) as at present. The sound which both the English and Huguenots brought with them was nearly alike, so that the mutual influence of the two languages (the surroundings of the vowel being nearly the same) would tend to retain the sound in the present pronunciation. The sound of *a* is difficult to describe. The Italian *a* sounds quite different from the Portuguese, French, English, or German *a*. What is the peculiar shade in each of these sounds? The Danish and English are inclined to the clear (higher) sound (cf. STORM, 'Eng. Philol.,' p. 34ff.), the German to the deeper sound. STORM (ibid.) regards the French *â* in *lâche*, *pâte* (low-back) as the normal *a*. But this *â* is rather the exception in France; the short, clear French *a* (*a*) is the rule. The Scotch *a* in *father* comes near the French *â* in *pâte*, but is probably less deep (cf. STORM, ibid.), while the English *a* in *father* (mid-back) approaches the palatal sound (*æ*). SWEET ('Hist. of Engl. Sounds,' p. 210) says the French *a* of the sixteenth century points to a sound between Swedish *mat* and Eng. *father* on the one side, and Eng. *man* on the other; that is, to Dan. *Mane*, or, more probably, to Eng. *man*, a sound which was fully established in the next century. In Charleston the tendency is rather to this last sound; as in *man*, *cat*, *sad*. No Charlestonian would make the mistake indicated by THACKERAY ('Miscell.' i, 58) in his *nong-tong-paw* (*n'en tends pas*), but would say *nang-tang-pæ* (*a* as in *man*). Perhaps the tendency to this clearer sound may be in a measure due to the influence of this (higher) French sound brought over by the Huguenots; it may have strengthened a tendency already existing.

The *ɔ* (*A* or *a*^o) -sound is common enough in Charleston but has never affected words like *gaunt*, *haunt*, *jaunt*, *daunt*, *avaunt*, *aunt*, *vaunt*, *haunch*, *launch*, *pauch*, *staunch*, etc., (cf. *grange*,

strange, ample, grant, chant, which were spelled with an *u* in M. E. and pronounced like those just given). According to TEN BRINK ('Chaucers Sprache und Verskunst, p. 50) this *au* ($\bar{a}^u$) "denotes the nasalized $\bar{a}$, or better the sound which represents in M. E. the Romance nasal *a*. It may have been a darker *a*, as the writing *au*, often interchanging with *a*, seems to indicate. This sound is inseparable from lengthening (Dehnung), since *au* never appears before *nk*, as in *frank*. It has its place before *mb, ng, nc, nt*." It is an evident attempt to represent the nasal pronunciation of the Anglonorman nasal vowel and VON JAGEMANN ('Trans. of Amer. Philol. Ass.,' vol. xv, p. 83) thinks that "this representation (by *au*) gives us a clue to the phonetic nature of the nasalization: *aun* must have been pronounced somewhat like the Portuguese $\tilde{a}o$, which is an *a*-sound followed by a nasal, and not like the French *an*, which is an *a*-sound itself nasalized. In later English the original sound gradually wore down to a simple long *a*, as in Mod. E. *vaunt*." These words had the ɔ -sound in England in the seventeenth century, but had not altogether discarded the (*a*)-sound. The clearer (*a*) changed to æ (as in *man*), but it is long in Charleston.

Turning to the French of the sixteenth century we find (THUROT, i, p. 425) that the pronunciation of *au* long fluctuated between *ao* (both vowels pronounced) and long *o* (mid-back-n. r.), which latter finally prevailed. However, the ancient pronunciation (ibid., 429) of the diphthong *au* existed in Normandy and the south. According to BEZA (1534) the Normans still pronounced distinctly the *a* and the *o* in one and the same syllable, *autant*, as if it were *aotant* (cf. HINDRET, who makes them say *fra-oude* for *fraude*, *ca-ouse* for *cause*, *cha-oud* for *chaud*). But this *au* interchanged in French with *o* (mid-mixed-w.-r.?) and *a* in some words. We find *pauvre*, *povre* and *pouvre*, but see later. Perhaps the word *balm* and those mentioned on p. 91, ibid., may be in part explained through Huguenot influence. On p. 433, vol. i, THUROT gives *baulsme*, *bame*, *ambamês*, *bausme*, *embasmer*, *embasme*, *baume*, *embaume*, *basme*, *baulme*, etc. The forms *bame*, *ambamês*, *embasmer*, *embasme*, *basme*, indicate an *a*-sound as one pronunciation of these words. From what has already been said of the French *a* of this period (sixteenth century), we can assume the lighter *a*-sound (nearly as in *man*). The M. E. form is *baume*, or *bawme* (CHAUCER), *baum*, *bame*, *basme*, *balsme*. The form *bame* is in 'Ancrén

Riwe,' p. 104. *Psalm* has the same history. THUROT i, page 440, gives *psalme*, *psealme*, *pseaulme*, *séaumes*. Anglo-Saxon has *sealm* and the M. E. probably fluctuated like *balm*, though I have no sources to look it up. The fluctuations were the same in both languages and they undoubtedly mutually influenced each other. Both sounds (ɔ, a) were probably brought over from England. But the lighter *a* of the French must have contributed to the establishment of *æ* (long sound of *a* in *man*) in all these words in Charleston. In modern French this sound has become *o*; in English, it has divided into ɔ, a, and æ, as we have already seen.

On p. 92, *ibid.*, it is stated that "the word *poor* sometimes received the sound (poor) instead of (puur)." In the sixteenth century the French shows a variety of spellings: *povre*, *pauvre*, *pouvre*, *paouvre*, *poure*, *pauure* (cf. THUROT, i., p. 430). Inasmuch as *au* exchanges with *o*, and *a*, in some words, and perhaps with *ou*, *u*, *eu* in a few others, we may infer from the various spellings of *pauvre* that usage was divided between *ao* (ao), *a-ou* (au), *o* (ò?), and *ou* (u). In CHAUCER, we find *povre* and *poure* (not in rhyme), perhaps from *pevre* (pðvr), the transitional form of O. Fr. *povre* (cf. above). The most that can be said is, that this sound must have been brought over from England and was probably prevalent there in the sixteenth century (cf. ELLIS, 97). It is also quite probable that the French brought over this same pronunciation of (pðvr). Compare the present pronunciation by some of the French creoles of Louisiana; *chose* (shòz), *rose* (ròz), *pauvre* (pðvr). The preservation of this occasional pronunciation (pððr) until now, is possibly due to Huguenot influence and partly to the conservative spirit of Charleston.

Exception has been taken to the pronunciation I have indicated (p. 93) for *book*. There the statement was made, that "that shade of the *u*-sound heard in *put*, *book*, *pull*, etc., has passed entirely over to its sound in *but*; hence the good majority of Charlestonians pronounce these words pʊt, etc., or is it, perhaps, the close Scotch *u* in *come*, *up*, SWEET's low-back-narrow?" The statement is in the main right, though the full *but*-sound is confined to the lower classes. The elegant pronunciation has stopped a shade short of *but*, as we shall presently see.

Let us begin with the vowel sound heard in *but*; SWEET calls it mid-back-narrow and SIEVERS describes it as "differing from the so-called pure Italian *a* and the *a* of the German stage only

by stronger arching of the back tongue toward the soft palate." It is between Italian *a* in *cane* and French *eu* in *leur* (cf. TRAUTMANN, p. 160, 40); ELLIS calls it an unrounded *leur*. This sound is peculiar to the English and is a younger (though according to HOLTSHAUS quite old) acquisition first mentioned by WALLIS (1653), though it must be older than that. "The first mediate testimony of its appearance, or better, its rise, is found in the substitution of *o* in *sonne*, *onder*, *wonie*, *wolf*, etc., for *sune*, *under*, *wunie*, *wulf*, etc., in the MSS. of the 13th century. To all appearances the projection of the lips in uttering the *u*-sound was omitted, so that SWEET's high-back-narrow arose (Gaelic *laogh*); this became later the present *but*-sound" (TRAUTMANN, p. 164). ELLIS (175) calls it "a modern encroachment." He adds that "in general the long Saxon (*oo*), which first became (*uu*) and then fell to (*u*), or (*u*), has resisted the further change into (*ə*)."¹ Generally this sound reverts back to the radical Anglo-Saxon *u* and the change from *u* to *o* explains in a certain measure the present sound of this *u* approaching *o*. It is the *u* deprived of its labial character, but at the same time accompanied by the enlargement of the angle of the jaws, which latter act is immediately connected with the sinking of the tongue, or in other words (*u*) is high-back-n.-r. and (*a*) is mid-back-n. If TRAUTMANN's theory be accepted (*Anglia* iv, 60 ff.; also i, 588-9), then there is a certain inner relation between the series of sounds to which the *u* in *but* belongs and the series *ü*, *ö*, *ó*; the latter he describes as arising when we join the lip-position of *u*, *ø*, *ø* to the tongue-position of *i*, *è*, *é*. We have already seen that the *u* in *but* is the unrounded *leur*, so that there seems at all events to be a certain relation both of articulation and sound existing between these sounds.

If we revert to PALSGRAVE's pronunciation, we shall find that his *o* in *gost*, *nose*, *boke*, does not mean the French unaccented *e*-feminine, but rather the *o* in *tonge*, *soche* (*suche*), *moche*, etc., therefore represents a sound between the *u* in *but* and the sound of the Gaelic *laogh* (SWEET's high-back-narrow Λ ; cf. HOLTSHAUS, *Anglia*, viii, 140). SWEET's second Word-list ('Hist. of Sounds,' 1888, p. 373f) proves that out of one hundred and forty words with the modern sound of *u* in *but*, seventy-five are from old *u*, seventeen are from old *ā*, sixteen from old *ō*, eleven from old *ȳ*, six from old *ö*, four from old *ā*, and the rest scattering between *ȳ*, *æ*, *ey*, *ē*, *æ*, *ī*, *eo*, *ā*. Thus, over one half are reflections of words in *u*. The question naturally arises why the

u-sound was abandoned and the *but*-sound received into its place, and through what sound did it pass in its transition from (u) to (a). The age of the *u*-sound is also a question of interest. We will begin with the *u*-sound.

The normal *u*-sound is not a favorite in modern English. In uttering it, the lips are less protruded than in German and the sound is less rounded. There is also a broadening of the body of the tongue which hinders the formation of the reed-shaped opening of the mouth necessary for producing an intensive normal (u): the massing of the tongue in the opening at the back palate checks the formation of the most intensive (i) possible. This explains in a measure the lack of the pure normal (u)- and (i)-sounds in English. The exchange of *u* and *o* in the transition period from Old to Middle English indicates that the real sound was midway between (o) and (ɔ); hence TRAUTMANN'S (φ), a tolerably dull vowel between the *u* in *but* and the *laogh*; that is, vacillating between both. Both incline to the *ü*- and *ö*-sounds, though more unrounded; *o* was between the German (back) *a* in *Vater* and the open *ö*-sound, that is, already near the *u* in *but*.—*u* was discarding the rounding of the lips, that is, changing to *laogh*. HOLTHAUS (ibid., 141) conjectures that this process began in the twelfth century. The passage was then from (u), high-back-narrow-round, through (ü, as in Norweg. *hus*) to (a) mid-back-narrow; therefore a passage from the articulation farthest back to one uniting the lip-protruding (rounding) of *u* and *o* to the tongue-articulations of the *e*- and *i*-sounds and bearing a close relation to the *ü*- and *ö*-sounds. Any obstruction in producing the *u* which should tend to change the place of the articulation farther lingual, would account for the transition. The Scandinavian *u* lies between (u) and (y), the Swedish nearer (y) than the Norwegian, and essentially identical or at least similar to Fr. *u* in *lui* (cf. STORM, 69). But there is also something of the *o*-element in the sound, so that there must have been an influence at work which tended to produce this effect. The *ö*-sound, to which our *but*-series inclines has in general the tongue-position of the *e*- and the lip-position of the *o*-sounds. In other words, there has been a gradual approach from the lowest towards the highest vowel and at the same time an approach of the *o*- and *i*-positions.

Again we ask what occasioned this change? May it not be consonant influence? The surrounding consonants seem to have played some part in the sound-change. The *n* follows oftener

than any other letter, fifty times; *s* twenty-one, *m* fourteen, *t* ten, *f* eight, *c* (or *k*) eight, *d* six, *p* six, *b* and *r* five, and the rest are scattering between *l*, *h*, *g* (afterwards *tch* or *f*). The consonants preceding the vowel are more varied: *l* (simply or in combinations) occurs fifteen times, *r* (simply or in combinations) fourteen, *s* eleven, *m* ten, *b* nine, *h* nine, *d* seven, *c* six, *n* five, *sh* five, *t* five, *st* four, and other consonants less frequently; we find besides *th*, *w*, *sw*, *f*, *g*, *y*, *p*. Six times we have an initial vowel. According to the above, *n* follows the vowel fifty times, and precedes five; *s* follows twenty-one, precedes eleven; *m* follows fourteen, precedes ten; *t* follows ten, precedes nine; *f* follows eight, precedes but once; *c* (or *k*) follows eight, precedes six; *d* follows six, precedes seven; *b* follows five, precedes nine; *r* follows five, precedes fourteen; *l* follows three, precedes fifteen; *h* follows two, precedes nine; *sh* follows three, precedes five; *p* follows six, precedes four.

It is admitted that those consonants which have a relationship of articulation with certain vowels modify the vowel sound. In estimating the effect produced upon the vowel, both the post- and pre-consonants must be considered. The most prominent post-consonants are *n*, *s*, *m*, *t*, *f*, *c* (*k*), *d*, *p*, etc., or those inclined to coronal and dorsal (labial) articulation. The most prominent pre-consonants are *s*, *m*, *b*, *d*, *t*, *h*, *r*, *sh*, etc., partly inclining to coronal and partly to dorsal and labial articulation.

Some of the most common words are *son*, *ton*, *won*, *come*, *such*, *honey*, *love*, *tongue*, etc. The Anglo-Saxon forms are *sunu*, *tunne*, *gewunnen*, *cuman*, *sunken*, *hunig*, *tunge*, *lufian*, etc. Most of the consonants have a strong inclination to dorsal (coronal) or labial (labio-dental and bilabial) articulation. Both labial and dorsal consonants readily assume the distinctive character of the accompanying vowel and are, at the same time, liable to color or obscure it. That is, the vowel easily loses its distinctive character and assumes the nature of a "mixed vowel." The "mixed vowel," which we know was between *u* and *o*, since these characters exchanged, stands in the good majority of cases (that is, in words now having the sound of *u* in *but*) between consonants with a dorsal element in their articulation, or labial and dorsal, and hence become subject to their influence. This obscuration is more liable to take place in unaccented syllables where the vowel is surrounded by consonants with dorsal or labial articulation, but even accented vowels are also obscured. It has already been observed (*Anglia* vii, 218) that the labials

m, *f*(*v*), change Anglo-Saxon *û* from (au) to (a); compare *scûm*, *scum*, *pûma*, *thumb*, *dûfe*, *dove*, etc.

As we see, these are the vary changes which we have considered necessary to produce our (a)-sound when starting from *au*, *u*, or *o*. Most of these consonants have a dorsal element and their peculiar English pronunciation intensifies their effect. For instance, *n*, *m* are post-coronal-alveolar and at the same time antedental-palatal, classed under supradental (that is, coronal-alveolar, or dorsal-alveolar) by SIEVERS; *s*, *z*, (*sh* *ʒ*) are post-coronal-alveolar; *t*, *d*, *p* are the same as *n*, *m*, that is, postdental or interdental (coronal articulation); *g*, *k*, are however formed on the middle of the soft palate, though *k*² (*g*²) are farther forward, perhaps guttural-dorsal; *f* and *w* are labiodentals and *b*, *p*, *m* are bilabials; the English *l* is alveolar and the *r* is supradental. The influence of most of these consonants, if exerted at all, would be to raise the *u* towards the *o*-position and at the same time to change it more to the *i*-position. They probably exerted such an influence, though it is difficult to say positively just what it was, or whether other unknown influences were not also at work. Scandinavian influence of *u* in *hus* may have helped. It is also probable that the O. E. *û* of the twelfth century "was spoken with deeper tongue-position, perhaps = *ö* (*schön*, *eux*), at the same time the original *û* unrounded to (Λ, as in *laogh*), or already to *φ* "(HOLTHAUS, *Anglia*, viii, 141). "It is difficult to say," he continues p. 143, "when long *o* assumed the sound *φ* (*ψ*) in certain words. Some words had early lost their length and turned immediately with short *o* to *ψ*, and others may have entered upon this way by analogy, or through some other influences."

There are sixteen examples of long *o* becoming (a): *môther*, *brôther*, *tôh* (*tough*), *glôf* (*glove*), *mônath*, *gûme* (*gum*), *rôthar*, (rudder), *flôd*, *blôd*, *dôm*, *ôthar*, *môste* (but cf. *muste*), *genôh* (enough), *wudurôfe* (woodruff), *gedôn* (done), *mônandaeg* (monday). The consonant-complex here is the same as above and it only needed a shortening of the vowel to produce the same result. HOLTHAUS' conjecture is probably the correct one, as we find the same shortening of a long vowel in *book*, *look*, *foot*, etc.

The question now arises whether the French exerted any influence on the production of this (a)-sound. ELLIS and SWEET say yes, but others are inclined to disbelieve it. The tendency of the English, as we have already mentioned, is to the deeper, duller, fuller sounds, due to the difference in

composition and position of the mouth and throat. SIEVERS (see above) justly remarks that the character of the sounds of the English vocalism rests essentially on the slight participation of the lips in their formation. The tip of the tongue inclines away from the lower front teeth upward, tendencies which have led to divergencies in the final result of this movement from *u* and *o* towards *ü* and *ö*.

The Latin *o* and *u* passed into French *o-fermé*. But in the accented and free syllable this sound passed into French *eu*; as, *HŌRAM heure*, *SŌLUM seul*. "The *o* of *amŏr*, *raison* was probably in its origin a diphthong holding a position midway between *o* and *ou* and rhyming neither with *u* coming from Latin *ū*, nor with *o* coming from Latin *o* or *au*. Very early this *o* became *eu*, *calorem* gave *chaleur*; *saporem*, *saveur*; *nodum*, *noeud*" (BARTSCH, 'Langue et Littérature Françaises,' p. 21). The development of the two sounds (French *eu* and English *u* in *but*) has a certain similarity and a certain disparity. The deeper sounds of the English may have become clearer than they otherwise would have been, had it not been for the contact with the French. But it turned to the unrounded (a), while the French has the rounded *eu* (*leur*). The two languages may have met when the development of this sound in both was nearly at the same stage.

Even this theory would seem to contradict itself, as the modern French *eu* comes mostly from the long or short Latin *o* (DIEZ, pp. 132, 133, 159; cf. THUROT i, p. 449 ff. for other sources) and none of these words which have developed the *eu* in modern French have the (a) in English (but compare later on for O. French). The Romance words with the (a)-sound in modern English have various sounds in modern French, but never *eu*. A careful comparison of the vocabularies of the two languages with a view to the classification of the sources of the various sounds which have produced (a) in modern English, showing their Latin origin and the French sounds now represented, is very desirable, but would lead me too far from my present subject. In lieu of this, I have carefully compared the vocabulary added to DIETRICH BEHRENS' "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Französischen Sprache in England," with the following results: The words there having the sound of (a) in modern English represent five modern French sounds: 1. mod. Fr. *u* (y) as in *adjudge*, *buffet* (?), *judge*, *judgment*, *justice*, *justify*, *multiply*, *publish*, *punish*, *supply*, *suppress*, *suspect*; 2. *ou* (u), as *butcher* (?), *butter*, *color*, *couple*, *coverlet*, *covet*, *culvert*, *double*,

glutton, *govern*, *governor*, *rut*, *sudden*, *suffer*, *supper*, *supple*, *sustenance*, *touch*, *truss*; 3. *on* (oq), as *assumption*, *comfort* (verb, O. Fr. *covoiter*, mod Fr. *convoiter*), *discomfit*, *juggler*, *number*, *plunge*, *trump*; 4. *o* (ð), as *brush*, *constable*, *nun*, *nunnery*, *sovereign*, *sum*; 5. *e*-feminine (ə) in the one word *succor*.

These same words represent seven different Latin sounds, two O. Fr. words, and three German words. Latin long *ū* is represented by *adjudge*, *judge*, *judgment* (root JŪDIC-), *glutton* (GLŪTO), *punish* (PŪNIRE), *govern* (GŪBERNARE), *buller* (Low Latin BŪTICULA); Latin short *u* furnishes *covet* (root is CŪPIDUS), *governor* (GŪBERNATOR), *sudden* (Low Latin SŪBITANUS), *sovereign* (Low Latin SŪPER+anus), *number*; Latin *u* in position has the largest number: *justice*, *justify*, *multiply*, *publish*, *supply*, *suppress*, *succor*, *double*, *rut* (Fr. *route*, Low Latin VIA RUPTA), *suffer*, *supple*, *sustenance*, *assumption*, *plunge* (Low Latin *PLUMBICARE), *trump* (trump-card, Lat. TRIUMPHO), *brush* (Low Latin BRUSTIA), *nun* (Low Latin NUNNA or NONNA), *nunnery*, *sum*. Latin long *ō* furnishes *couple*, *culvert* (Lat. root CŌLARE, O. Fr. *coulouère*); Latin short *o* gives *juggler* (JŌCULATOR), *color*, *constable* (CŌMES STABULI); Latin *o* in position furnishes *truss* (Lat. root TORTUS, Low Latin *TORTIARE. O. Fr. *trusser*, *trosser*), *country* (Low Latin CONTRADA). The Latin particle CON (*co*) gives *cover*, *covered* (Fr. *couvrelit*, from *couvrir* and *lit*; Latin CO-OPERIRE), *comfort* (Low Latin CONFORTARE), *discomfit*. The O. French furnishes two: *buffet* (origin doubtful), and *butcher* (O. Fr. *boc*, *bouc*, that is, *buck-killer*). From the German we have *supper* (Low German *suppen*), and *touch* (O. H. G. *zucchen*), und probably *grudge*.

The sources of the (a)-sound represented by the Romance element of modern English are not so varied as in the Anglo-Saxon element. Still the leading vowels are the same (that is, *u*, *o*) as in the Anglo-Saxon element; *ū*, *ō* are also common to both elements. The consonant-complex is the same. We also know that in the sixteenth century these Romance vowels (*u*, *o*, also with *ou*, *eu*) were interchangeable in French. Thus, the conditions are the same as in the Anglo-Saxon element, and as soon as the words became nationalized they would suffer the same fate. Even in French the Latin long and short *u* have melted together and appear as (a) and (ä) in the accented syllable of modern English. If we go back to CHAUCER's language, these two *u*'s which produced modern (a) and (ä) still preserved a different sound. The *u* corresponding to French *u* (y) was spoken more like *ö* without lip-rounding than like the short *u*

in the Netherland *dus, tusschen* (TEN BRINK, 'Chaucers Spr. u. Versk.,' p. 53). The unaccented *u* suffered the same fate as the accented. When in a protected position we have (a) and (ä). In the open syllable it exceptionally appears in modern English as (a); cf. M. E. *stodie, stodienden*, mod. E. *study, studied*. In the close syllable, French unaccented *u* (y) shared the fate of *u*, and exchanged with *o*, as in *jostyce, bornyst, torkye*. It was regularly short in M. E., and probably represents exactly the same sound lying midway between *u* in *but* and Gaelic *laogh* described above. As in the Anglo-Saxon element, it developed in different ways according as it stood in an unaccented syllable or one with secondary accent, in open or close syllable. Cf. mod. E. *jealously, coverture, glutton, covet, color, summons, juggler, russet, buffet, company, comfort, country, covenable* with *journey, courtesy, burgess, conduit*, etc. We not only find an exchange of *u* with *o*, but also in rare cases before a protected nasal *ou* appears; as, *scoumfit* (Cl. 151), *coumfort* (Pt. 223), *countre* (P. 297), etc. This orthography possibly indicates that the vowel was not always short. We also find *trobleth* and *troubleth*, *dobleth* and *doubleth*. This difference of spelling is represented in the modern English *just, joust* and *adjust* (all from Low Latin JUXTARE, ADJUXTARE). The M. E. spelling *ioustes, ioustynde* would possibly indicate a long vowel, but even if some of these vowels still preserved their length in the sixteenth century, they must have become common or short in the period of the transition to the sound in *laogh*.

In the French of the sixteenth century, we find an exchange of both the *u* and the *o* (and also *ou*) with *eu*. The words which more nearly concern us are: *je trouve, je treuve, je prouve, je preuve, je esprouve, je reprouve, je repreuve* (modern French *épreuve, preuve*), *je couvre, je coeuvre, cueuvrechief, queuvrechief, meuvons, que je meuve, je souffers, flourir, fleurir, florissant, fleurissant* (THUROT i., p. 454 ff.). If we turn to the English of the same period, we shall find the same exchange. Thus we have *proue, preooin, preouen, preued, preue, reproue, repreue, preofunge, preef, proof; controue, controeuued, contreue, contreeue; I retrieve* (cf. O. Fr. *retrouve* and *retreuue*); *couere, kuuere, keouere, keuere* (cf. modern *kivver* in Leistershire); *kercheues, keuerchifs; couerled, couerlite; suffre, soffre*, but never *souffre*, nor *seuffre*. In modern English these words furnish a number of sounds: *prove* (u), *proof* (u), *reprieve* (i), *contrive* (ai), *Kerchief* (ë), and our (a) in *cover, coverlet, suffer*. The rhymes are also interesting: *meuen: cleuen, (cleófan: swo-*

uen, swefen). *proued* (: *houe, behôfian*), *proue* (: *woze, wôgian*; *byhoue*: *loue I*); *reproue* (: *loue*: *byhoueth*); *approve* (: *move*: *love*); *preued* (: *heued, heafod*: *leued*); *preue* (: *Eue*: *leue*); *repreue* (: *leue*: *greue*: *beleue*); *controue* (: *moue*). By the rhymes *approve*: *move*: *love*, we see that two distinct mod. E. sounds [u and (a)] were at this period near enough alike to rhyme with each other and the same may be said of all these words. It is difficult to determine just what this sound was, but PROF. TEN BRINK (*ibid.*, p. 51) has described it as accurately as possible when he says: "The spelling *ew* is also likewise found where the sound *ü* (y) stands before a vowel: *mewe* beside *muwe* (Fr. *mue*), *remewe*. Both this spelling (*ew*) and the origin of *eschewe* (O. H. G. *scuhan*), *sewe* (O. H. G. *siuwan*) tend to show that the M. E. *ü*-sound stood nearer the *ö*-sound and perhaps came very near the Alsatian pronunciation of German *u* or Fr. *ou*."

Thus, again, we find ourselves in contact with a sound intermediate between *ü* and *ö* and approaching the sound intermediate between (a) and Gaelic *laogh*. But this particular variety of this still-undetermined sound furnished but few words with the (a)-sound in mod. Eng. and very few with the *eu*-sound in mod. Fr. Yet, enough in each case to show that it stood on the same *niveau* with the sound of different origin from which the mod. Eng. (a)-sound was developed and may have been influenced by this undetermined sound, if it did not itself influence it.

We have mentioned the shortening of the long *ō* and its transition to (a). But it rarely took this course. Frequently it passed to (uu), as *sōne, soon*; *bōk, book*; *fōt, foot*. "The passages already cited from Palsgrave and Bullokar show that in their pronunciation M. E. *ō* had not yet been changed completely into (uu), as in the pronunciation of the other first Middle English authorities: Palsgrave and Bullokar probably pronounced *book* exactly as Swedish (*book*, Ellis)" (SWEET'S 'Hist. of Engl. Sounds,' p. 239). It is SWEET'S mid-mixed-round, short in Fr. *homme*; cf. It. *uomo*. It is also heard in Western New York in *home* (Hoom), *stone* (stoon, or perhaps better ston). This is in all probability the identical sound from which the present (a) started in its transition to its present sound. We find isolated instances of its existence (that is of oo or o) in various parts of the country and it is heard in Charleston in such word as *book, look, shook, cook, could, would*, etc., sometimes long and sometimes short. In the mouth of the vulgar it drops to (a). We can therefore distinguish three shades in the pronunciation

of *book*, etc. The first is the standard pronunciation of the cultured (buuk, or buk); it is the learned pronunciation used at the schools and by the few who pride themselves on a classic pronunciation. The second is heard in older persons and in those who have not been influenced by the more learned pronunciation (book, or bok). Often, however, the lower classes drop to a sound corresponding to the Scotch sound in *come up* and even to (a).

The influence of the earlier French on the pronunciation of *Beaufort* and *Beaufain* has already been noticed in the 'Trans. of Mod. Lang. Ass.' iii, p. 94. It is undoubtedly the direct influence of the Huguenot settlement here in the state. They probably brought with them the older pronunciation of *eau* (Dans la terminaison *eau*, l'e- féminin se fit entendre longtemps, particulièrement dans les mots en *ceau* et *zeau*, *morceau*, *ruisseau*, *museau*, dans *marteau*, *bateau*, dans *pseume*, et jusqu'à la fin du siècle dans *eau*; mais on n'entendait plus que *o* dans la plupart des mots. THUROT, ii, p. 747). We can possibly see the influence on the Charleston pronunciation of *due*, etc.

Consonant influence is less marked and of too subtle a nature to be traced back to its origin. The gutturals (g, k) present the greatest similarity in the two languages. On page 97 (ibid.) we discussed the palatalization of these letters in words like *garden*, *cart*, etc. The French of the latter part of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth offers a similar process for our study. DANGEAU (1645-1723, cf. THUROT, ii, pp. 197-8), a Parisian, says: "Il faut remarquer qu'en françois devant les *é* fermés, les *è* ouverts et la voyèle *eu*, on prononce ces deus consones un peu mouillées et come s'il y avait un petit *i*: on prononce *guèrir* come s'il y vait *guïèrir*, *rigueur* come s'il y aviat *riguieur*, *question* comes s'il y avait *quiestion*, *vainquenr* come s'il y avait *vainquieur*. BOINDIN (Paris, 1676-1751) makes the same remark. DANGEAU's work was published in 1694 and BOINDIN's in 1709, the very period in which the Huguenots were emigrating to America. How extensive this palatalization was in France, or to what regions it was confined we are not informed by THUROT. But it was absolutely denied by contemporaries and may be only a fancy of these writers. Still they were accurate in other respects and such a pronunciation may have existed, though not recognized as standard. It would be impossible to say whether it was brought here by them, as the French has disappeared. But it may have strengthened a tendency already existing.